

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume X, Issue No. 11

May 2005

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Who's Better Off?

By Rep. Ron Paul

One question the Iraq war promoters don't want to hear asked -- because they don't want to face up to the answer -- is this: "Are Christian Iraqis better off today?" The answer is plainly no.

The 800,000 Christians in Iraq were free to practice their religion under Saddam Hussein. Tariq Aziz, a Christian, served in Hussein's cabinet as Foreign Minister - something that would never happen in Saudi Arabia, Israel, or any other Middle Eastern country. But today Christians in Iraq are no longer safe. Many have been forced to migrate. It's strange that the human rights advocates in the U.S. Congress have expressed no concern for the Iraqi Christians. Both the Sunni and the Shiite Muslims support the attacks. In fact, persecuting Christians is one of the few areas in which they agree.

But there's another question that is equally important: "Are the American people better off because of the Iraq war?"

One thing for sure, the 1,500 dead American soldiers aren't better off. The nearly 20,000 severely injured or sickened American troops are not better off. The families and friends of those who lost so much are not better off.

The 40,000 troops who were forced to re-enlist against their will are not feeling better off. They believe they have been deceived by their enlistment agreements.

The American taxpayers are not better off having spent over \$200 billion, with billions yet to be spent. The inflation that always accompanies war is already giving Americans a dose of what will become much worse.

Are our relationships with the rest of the world better off? I'd say no.

Our alliances with the Europeans are weaker than ever. The anti-American hatred among Muslims is greater than ever. Iraq is being used as a training ground for al Qaeda terrorists, which it never was under Hussein's rule.

Oil was approximately \$27 a barrel before the war, now it's more than twice that. I wonder who benefits?

The war has played a key role in diminishing morale in our military services. Recruitment is sharply down, and most branches face shortages. Many young Americans rightly fear a coming draft - which will be required if we do not reassess our foreign policy.

The appropriations for the war are increasing the runaway deficit and the national debt. If these trends persist, inflation with economic stagnation will be the inevitable consequences.

One of the most significant consequences of war is the loss of personal liberty. Too often in the patriotic nationalism that accompanies armed conflict there is a willingness to sacrifice personal freedoms in pursuit of victory. The irony is that we are told to go hither and yon to fight for freedom, while carelessly sacrificing the very freedoms here at home we're supposed to be fighting for. Security has replaced liberty as our main political goal, damaging the American spirit.

These attitudes and fears surrounding the 9-11 tragedy, and our war against a country not responsible for the attack, have allowed a callousness to develop in our national psyche that justifies torture and rejects due process of law for those who are suspects and not convicted criminals.

We have come to accept pre-emptive war as necessary, constitutional, and morally justifiable. Starting a war without a proper

declaration is now of no concern to most Americans or the U.S. Congress.

A large segment of the Christian community thinks nothing of rationalizing war in the name of a religion that prides itself on the teachings of the Prince of Peace, who instructed us that blessed are the peacemakers - not the warmongers.

We casually accept our role as world policeman, and believe we have a moral obligation to practice nation building in our image regardless of the number of people who die in the process.

We have lost our way by rejecting the beliefs that made our country great. We no longer trust in trade, friendship, peace, the Constitution, and the principle of neutrality while avoiding entangling alliances. Spreading the message of hope and freedom by setting an example has been replaced by a belief that armed might is the only practical tool to influence the world.

In the process, Congress and the people have endorsed a usurpation of their own authority, generously delivered to the executive and judicial branches - not to mention international government bodies. National sovereignty is now seen as an issue that concerns only the fringe in our society.

Protection of life and liberty must once again become the issue that drives political thought in this country. If this goal is replaced by an effort to promote world government, use force to plan the economy, regulate the people, and police the world, it can be done only with the establishment of a totalitarian state. There's no need for that. It's up to Congress and the American people to decide our fate, and there is still time to correct our mistakes. -- April 5, 2005

Build Your Own Gun, Save 10%!

Richard Patrick Celata is an old-fashioned Yankee toolmaker who came into his profession the old-fashioned way: as an apprentice under his father. A resident of Massachusetts, he watched the erosion of the Bill of Rights and decided to do something about it. Specifically, he decided to devote his skills to guarantee the continuation of the Second Amendment.

Through his company KT Ordnance, Celata now produces incomplete (80% finished) frames made according to the highest standards of repeatable CNC precision. Not only are these frames built according to the numbers, but they are easy for the average person to finish.

These frames are non-firearms; they are completely legal to own and build, and anonymous as well (form 4473 need NOT be filed). For regulations and more information about these products, please visit their web page at <http://www.ktordnance.com> or call (406) 834-3611 between 8am and 4pm MST.

As a special bonus to JPFO supporters, KT Ordnance will give you 10% off AR-15 receivers and 1911s -- just mention JPFO when you order. You don't even have to be a JPFO member!

As reported in our May 11 alert (<http://www.jpfo.org/alert20050511.htm>), the federal government is sending up a red flag with the advent of a national ID card. Obtaining and keeping firearms is going to become very difficult, and even more so when your firearms are registered or otherwise papered. Building your own is an easy way to avoid these pitfalls, and federal law says it's legal.

The days are numbered for gun ownership in America; now is the time to learn to produce your own!

Special note: JPFO is not in the firearms business, nor do we receive any compensation from KT Ordnance for sales, referrals, or anything else. Customers must deal directly with KT Ordnance for all aspects of their purchase! Please visit <http://www.ktordnance.com> for more information.

-- Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, PO Box 270143 Hartford, Wisconsin 53027 Phone: 1-262-673-9745 Order line: 1-800-869-1884 (toll-free!)

Fax: 1-262-673-9746
Web: <http://www.jpfo.org/>

CyberBug

If a kite appears to be following you in La Plata, Md., it very well may be.

The Charles County Sheriff's Office recently monitored a gathering of motorcycle riders by launching a remote-control aerial camera to watch for emergencies or troublemakers.

"I liked what I saw", said Lt. Chris Becker, the agency's commander of homeland security and intelligence. A tactical operations team member could readily carry the battery-powered spy plane in the trunk of his patrol car and assemble it in just minutes.

Still, not everybody is pleased with the mini spy plane, marketed by Cyber Defense Systems Inc.

Susan Goering, executive director of the ACLU of Maryland, said devices such as CyberBug are an intrusion on a citizen's civil rights.

"The concern is, obviously, a privacy issue, but also that the constitutional right to assemble is being chilled," Miss Goering said. "We are fast approaching the time when the government will be monitoring our every move."

She also said the issue is of special concern when citizens rally against the government.

"Dissent in this country is the lifeblood of democracy," Miss Goering said. "If someone is attending an event that's [anti-government], they should be able to do so without fear the government will retaliate in some manner."

Lt. Becker said the "CyberBug" went on two 30-minute flights April 17 over the 12th annual Southern Maryland "Blessing of the Bikes" at the Charles County Fairgrounds, which organizers said was attended by about 8,000 people.

A base-model CyberBug costs \$7,500 and can be placed in a stationary position or controlled with a joystick device. It can stay in the air for more than three hours and comes with a variety of features - including the camera, a global positioning system and an explosive trigger for qualified customers.

-- Washington Times, April 30, 2005

Special Privileges and Factions

The welfare state cannot

sustain freedom because government welfarism destroys a limited and objective framework of law by extending special privileges to certain segments of society at the expense of other segments.

For example, the welfare state grants special tax breaks to corporations at the expense of individual earners; it awards quotas to ethnic minorities at the expense of better qualified applicants; it conveys welfare subsidies to the less productive at the expense of the more productive, etc.

To put it bluntly, the welfare state destroys the philosophy of "equal rights for all" in favor of "special privileges for factions." It is a doctrine of "legal" favoritism that must, by its very nature, lead to dissension, corruption and tyranny.

What possible hope for peace and good will can there be when some men and women (by joining into a large enough group) are allowed to use government coercion and intervention to reach their desires, while all other men and women are required to use only their own productive effort?

What possible kind of life can people live when the degree of their freedom is determined, not by the prestipulated law of the Constitution, but by the variable whims of bureaucrats -- whims that can descend upon one at anytime in order to pacify the demands of the Wall Street banks, the mega-corporations, the AFL-CIO, welfare recipients, environmentalists, gay advocates, or Jesse Jackson and the Rainbow Coalition?

What kind of social climate develops when some people are penalized for their ability and self-reliance, and others are rewarded for the power of their lobbies on Capitol Hill and their protest marches in the streets? What kind of individual freedom and economic stability can we have when men and women are subjected to such injustice? What type of country will evolve from such arbitrary and unjust rule?

The last four decades of political-economic turmoil in America have shown us what type of country -- a totally chaotic assemblage of special interest groups all protesting for and squabbling over whatever privileges, controls and subsidies they can extract from government. And none of the beneficiaries willing to contemplate the destruction of individual freedom they

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

are perpetrating in the process.

It is in the very nature of the welfare state and its evolution that we get a glimpse of one of the most important issues of political philosophy: Governments can be organized under one of two types of law: limited and objective, or open-ended and arbitrary.

Which type we choose determines our way of life. The first leads to individualism and freedom; the second to collectivism and tyranny.

The fact that the welfare state is democratic does not convey legitimacy to its arbitrary legislative power, nor does it justify the vast array of privileges that its factions and majorities vote for themselves. Tyranny is still tyranny, whether it is one man, ten men, or millions of men usurping the rights of the individual. The welfare state, despite its democratic implementation, is just another form of despotism that, if left unchecked, will steadily evolve into a more centralized tyranny.

A New Revolution Is in the Air

By Henry Lamb

Why does the federal government own 65% of all the land west of Denver, and less than 2% of the land east of Denver? Who cares?

Everyone should care. The federal government was not created to be the owner of the land; it was created to get the "right of soil" out of the hands of a king - that is, out of the hands of government – and into the hands of the people.

The Treaty of Paris of 1783 that ended the Revolutionary War was not with the Federal government, which didn't exist. The treaty was between the king of England and each of the enumerated states. The treaty specifically recognizes these states "to be free sovereign and independent states, that he [the king] treats with them as such, and for himself, his heirs, and successors, relinquishes all claims to the government, propriety, and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof."

The question of equality among the original thirteen states of the United States of America was resolved by the Supreme Court by the principle known as the "Equal Footing Doctrine," which supposedly insured that all states were equal in their sovereign power. Article I, Section 8 specifies how the federal government might lawfully acquire land, and the purposes for which it could be acquired from the states. The 10th Amendment further declared that powers not explicitly granted to the

federal government were retained by the states, and the people.

Where, then, is the equality for the states west of the 100th meridian?

The federal government owns about 98% of the land in Alaska, and about 86% of Nevada. Overall, the feds own 65% of all the land west of the 100th meridian. This fact makes a mockery of the Equal Footing Doctrine that was so important to the founders.

Despite the intentions of the founders and the Equal Footing Doctrine, the states east of the 100th meridian are vastly "more equal" than the states to the west.

There is no valid reason why the federal government should own this land. Originally, it was purchased, or won, as a security measure for the Eastern states. Originally, the federal government's objective was to get the newly acquired land into private hands as quickly as possible. The sale of the land helped to pay off the debts that accumulated during the revolutionary war. Toward the end of the 19th century, and throughout the 20th century, the goals and objectives of the federal government changed, due to the growing influence in the East of people who bought into the socialist ideal.

In fact the foundation of socialism is the idea that government should own the sources of production, and distribute its benefits "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need".

The land owned by the federal government is rich in resources, which should be the property of the states, and the people who live there. The states, and the people who live there, should decide how the land and its resources are used.

But no. In the West, the federal government not only dictates how the land will be used, it also dictates how the law will be enforced. Duly elected county sheriffs are forced to stand aside while the U.S. Forest service confiscates the private property of ranchers who allow their cattle to eat grass that the federal government claims as its own - despite a hundred years of undisputed ownership by the rancher's family.

The federal government should not own land, other than that authorized in the Constitution. It should not be dictating how land is used in any state, and it should not be enforcing its will over the authority of local elected officials.

Several efforts to change this situation in the past have failed. The problem only worsens, and the tension between government and private land

ownership is inspiring a new, better-organized effort to get the government out of the real estate business. Perhaps a new revolution is in the air. – April 18, 2005

Dietary Supplements under Global Stealth Attack

The United Nation's Codex Alimentarius Commission will hold its 28th General Session in Rome, Italy, April 4-9, 2005. At this meeting, a group of unelected bureaucrats will -- barring a miracle -- ratify a framework for a restrictive global trade standard for vitamins and minerals which can be forced on all of us via an insidious process known as "globalization and harmonization of the laws." This "harmonization" (standardization) process could be extended to our hemisphere by the so-called Free Trade Agreement of the Americas -- a carbon copy of the European Union -- as a prelude to world government.

(A World Health Organization committee chaired by a US FDA employee named Christine Lewis Taylor is in a process of filling in the blanks on allowable potency levels with the following numbers: B-1: 1.3 mg, B-2: 4.5 mg, Beta Carotene: 4 mg, Vitamin D: 5 mg, B-6: 5.4 mg, B-12: 9mg, Vitamin E-15 mg (synthetic form only allowed), B-3 (Niacin) 17 mg, just because some sensitive people get the niacin flush at low doses.)

In the United Kingdom, despite over a million vitamin consumers signing a petition against harmonizing to the EU Food Supplement Directive, the ruling Labor Party totally ignored the petitioners, taking the view that because the UK is a member of the EU it therefore has no choice but to harmonize UK law to the EU's standard.

How to stop the UN's Codex Alimentarius in its tracks:

1. Sign on to <http://www.iahf.com> for updates
2. Sign on to <http://www.alliance-natural-health.org> for updates
3. Read this article http://www.lef.org/featured-articles/emergency_update_020705.htm

State Legislatures Weigh In on Gun Debate

With more than four out of five states allowing law-abiding citizens to carry concealed weapons, the nation's argument over guns turns on how much to loosen the rules - should guns be allowed in judge's chambers? Bars? In workplace parking lots?

Following the latest spate of fatal shootings the debate has changed. The 1999 Columbine school shootings sent moms marching for tougher gun laws, but this year, many state legislators are looking at ways to broaden access to weapons and ease training and other requirements.

New Mexico state Rep. Thomas Anderson said local judges asked him to change the law to let judges carry weapons into their court chambers. "I believe in [self-defense]," Anderson said.

His bill died in committee, but it will be back next year. New Mexico this year already broadened its concealed-weapons law to drop the age requirement to 21 and allow the state to reach agreements with other states so gun-carriers can cross borders without worry.

The push for concealed weapons began in the late 1980s, when all but 10 states refused to allow residents to do so, or only allowed it in special circumstances. But starting in 1989, those barriers fell. Now it's up to 46, with 35 states allowing just about anyone who is not a felon to get a permit.

The late 1990s saw a rise in gun control legislation. In 1999, after 15 were killed, including the gunmen, at Columbine High School in Colorado, gun control gained a sharp edge and legislators' attention.

Violence hasn't subsided this year, from courthouse shootings in Atlanta and Tyler, Texas, to the school killings at Red Lake, Minn., the most deadly since Columbine. But the reaction has spurred something far different, drawing on the idea that if the victims had weapons they might not be victims.

"At the scene of these crimes, despite all the good intentions of the police, the prosecutors, the courts, the judges - they're all coming in later," said Wayne LaPierre, chief executive of the National Rifle Association. "The country as a whole is taking another look, that maybe it makes good sense to allow people to protect themselves in as many situations as possible."

Current legislation in some cases is a direct response to the recent shootings, though often predates it. In recent weeks:

Florida legislators passed a measure allowing people to "meet force with force" to defend themselves without fear of prosecution, extending the right from their homes to anywhere they're legally allowed to be. Gov. Jeb Bush said he intends to sign it.

Arizona's Senate approved letting people carry guns into bars and restaurants, as long as they're not drinking. The House has yet to act.

North Dakota legislators approved removing the shooting test needed for a concealed-weapon permit, though the bill awaits final approval from the governor.

Even schools and workplaces, the scene of some of the most horrific violence, saw restrictions fall. A new Virginia law lets people with concealed handguns onto school grounds, as long as they and the gun remain in their car. A 2004 Oklahoma law lets employees with permits keep guns in cars in job parking lots.

"Employers have a responsibility to make their workplace a safe place. For them to let workers with guns onto the premises is insane," said Brian Seibel, senior counsel at the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence. And bars? "Hello? Do you want to mix alcohol and guns?"

The shift in opinion and legislation comes directly from the election outcomes of 2000 and 2004, and the national focus on security after Sept. 11, both sides agree.

Still, the struggle hasn't all been one-sided.

Missouri, where legislators approved a concealed-weapon law even though a statewide referendum rejected it in 1999, gave cities the right to restrict weapons on city-owned property. Pennsylvania Gov. Ed Rendell and Philadelphia Mayor John Street, both Democrats, are studying sweeping changes.

Illinois, one of the significant battlegrounds, saw legislation that seeks to ban .50-caliber ammunition, close a loophole that allows sales at gun shows without background checks, and require guns to be sold with "trigger lock" safety devices. Gun-rights interests scored a victory last week by killing a bill that would allow lawsuits against gun dealers.

Anderson, in New Mexico, said, "There should be the possibility that any house on the street should have a weapon. Do I think every house should have one? No. But the bad guy should think so." -- April 5, 2005

Border Volunteers Take Positions in Ariz.

NACO, Ariz. (AP) - Citizens who volunteered to watch for illegal immigrants and smugglers dotted a swath of the Mexican border in a month long effort to bolster authorized patrols.

Volunteers for the Minuteman Project gathered in groups of three or four spaced out about every quarter mile. Some sat in lawn chairs, others stood scanning the desert with binoculars.

Dave Carpinello, a Denver investment banker who had a pistol on his hip and wore a T-shirt reading "I defended the border," said he came out of concern that potential terrorists could penetrate the porous border.

"For me, it's not so much concern for the illegal immigration," said Carpinello. "Anyone and their mother could fly to Mexico and walk right over here. That's a scary thought."

Border patrol officials said the volunteers have been peaceful but have still been disrupting U.S. Border Patrol operations by unwittingly tripping sensors that alert agents to possible intruders. Agents have to respond to the false alarms, which pulls them off their normal patrols, said Andy Adame, a patrol spokesman.

"Now we not only have to look out for aliens and drug smugglers, now we have to look out for these untrained civilians who are unfamiliar with the landscape," he said.

The volunteers, many of whom were recruited over the Internet, plan to watch the border in shifts 24 hours a day during April and report any illegal activity to federal agents. It's an exercise some law enforcement officials fear could lead to vigilante violence or an accidental confrontation between armed volunteers and authorities.

Organizers said they would have 200 volunteers out Monday. There was no way to verify the count independently.

The idea, according to project organizers, is partly to draw attention to problems on the Arizona-Mexico border, considered the most vulnerable stretch of the 2,000-mile southern border. Of the 1.1 million illegal immigrants caught by the Border Patrol last year, 51 percent crossed into the country at Arizona.

But things were quiet in the area where Carpinello and a companion have been stationed.

"No one's crossing and that was the goal, to show the government that if we have people out here no one's going to cross," said Chris Simcox, Minuteman field operations director.

Adame said apprehension numbers have gone down since the volunteers arrived, an indication that fewer people might be trying to cross. But he also noted that the Mexican military and police have been conducting some kind of operation south

of the Naco area, which tends to drive down crossings. -- AP April 5, 2005

Minuteman Project:
<http://www.minutemanproject.com>

Judicial Notice and US v. Miller

By a Massachusetts Patriot

In 1939 the United States Supreme Court ruled that a sawed-off shotgun was NOT a militia firearm protected by the Second Amendment because (according to them) only a firearm that was part of the ordinary military equipment was so protected and (according to them) shotguns were not "part of the ordinary military equipment or could contribute to the common defense". (*US v. Miller*, 307 US 174, 178). Amazingly the justices were ignorant of the widespread use of scatter guns during the Revolutionary War, and shotguns in trench warfare in France during World War I.

Recently a federal court in Arkansas clearly noted the sawed-off shotgun is protected by the right to bear arms guaranteed by the Second Amendment of the Constitution.

So why is it not logical to believe that if someone should go back into federal court with proof that machine guns, rifles, shotguns, handguns are part of the ordinary military equipment, AND contribute to the common defense, as the Supreme Court has asked for proof of, that ALL federal courts must obey the Supreme Court ruling that sets these standards of proof?

Can a person or gun club out there do a Declaratory Judgment in a federal court and bring in a bunch of pictures showing the type of guns used by the military AND other guns that could contribute to the common defense so we can get this on the record?

When we do this, the Supreme Court says we win.

The Supreme Court is still officially ignorant of the types of firearms that are used by the military or could be used to contribute to the common defense. As soon as they take "judicial notice" of these firearms the Second Amendment would (once again) secure the right of the "militia" of the Constitution to possess those firearms. But somebody has to tell them.

NO ONE has ever brought judicial notice to the attention of the justices that the military has guns which can be used by the sovereign militia of this nation.

NO ONE has ever informed ALL federal courts about every type

firearm that could contribute to the common defense.

Who out there who has time to do this?

DOJ Confirms 2d Amendment Confers Individual Right

The Second Amendment Foundation has hailed a report from the U.S. Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel that concludes the Second Amendment "secures an individual right to keep and bear arms."

The 93-page document details the exhaustive research by Assistant Attorneys General Steven G. Bradbury, Howard C. Nielson, Jr., and C. Kevin Marshall who studied the history of legislation and court cases to reach their conclusion. They note that, **"our examination of the original meaning of the Amendment provides extensive reasons to conclude that the Second Amendment secures an individual right, and no persuasive basis for either the collective-right or quasi-collective-right views."**

"This report confirms what the gun rights community has known to be true for many years," said SAF founder Alan M. Gottlieb. "The right to keep and bear arms is a right to be enjoyed and exercised by every citizen. Henceforth, all Americans will know that the claim by anti-gunners that the Amendment only protects some mythical right of the states to form militias and National Guard units is an outright fraud."

The entire report is available at <http://www.usdoj.gov/olc/secondamendment2.htm>

True Patriots Should Worry about Freedom at Home

By Ivan Eland

The most draconian provisions of the PATRIOT Act will sunset at the end of 2005. Yet the "freedom loving" Bush administration is busily lobbying Congress to make those provisions permanent.

The most pernicious provision is section 215. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) of 1978 set up a secret court to approve Executive Branch search warrants in espionage and terrorism cases. The clandestine court, unlike other courts, never notifies people that the government is spying on them, hears only the government's arguments, and publishes no information about its activities or the warrants approved or denied. Apparently, the FISA court has rejected only a few government requests for such warrants. The reasoning behind creation of the clandestine court was

that a lower standard of evidence should apply in intelligence cases. (No matter that secret courts in a free republic are questionable at best and that the Constitution's Fourth Amendment requires that government search warrants, without exception, be issued only on the high legal standard of probable cause that a crime has been committed.)

Before the PATRIOT Act, the FBI had to provide "specific and articulable facts giving reason to believe that the person to whom the records pertained" was a spy or terrorist and convince the FISA court to issue the clandestine warrant. The PATRIOT Act allows the FBI to obtain a secret search warrant merely by certifying that the records are sought for a terrorism or espionage investigation. Upon FBI certification, the court must then issue the warrant. In short, Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act eliminates the check of judicial review on the FBI.

Thus, the FBI can investigate anybody without "probable cause" and without having to demonstrate that the subject's records are relevant to an investigation. In other words, the lower legal standards for intelligence collection of the secret court can now be applied to criminal investigations other than those for terrorism or espionage -- further undermining the Constitution's guarantee of a "probable cause" standard for search warrants.

The Executive Branch is using its expanded investigative authority zealously. According to the Electronic Frontier Foundation, the FISA court is secretly authorizing more surveillance than all other federal courts put together.

Section 215 is only one of many severe restrictions on civil liberties contained in the PATRIOT Act. For example, other provisions of the law—such as roving wiretaps and national, instead of local, jurisdiction for warrants for electronic evidence—appear to erode Fourth Amendment requirements that warrants specifically describe persons, places, and things to be searched. Not only should the sunset provisions of the Act be put to rest, Congress should repeal the entire law.

The purported tradeoff between civil liberties and national security is a false one. No dubious usurpations of freedom like the PATRIOT Act would exist if the United States would avoid unnecessarily creating and inflaming anti-American groups overseas with its overly interventionist foreign policy. A more restrained policy abroad would better

preserve both liberty and security at home.

Letter to a Senator

Senator Averitt

Due to the extreme measures taken against the rights of the people and our common law by the Annexation movement whereby cities can "annex" adjacent property, the following questions are being brought to you and the Texas Assembly. These questions are by no means final but only the beginning.

1. Is the body which advances the goals of annexation a lawful body? That is, are they lawfully elected by the people? If not, what lawfully elected body appointed these committees?

2. If the American people held their property in allodium would this annexation movement hold any power over us?

3. How did the annexation committees come to the conclusion that it has the absolute authority and power to violate and override the Great Creator's laws including Deut. 19:4 "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark", and the structure of our form of government which was created to protect we the people against abuses generated by the system which governs us? And let me remind this Commission that our laws were based on the principles of Christ.

Ostensibly the annexation movement is indeed in line with the first plank of the communist manifesto, which is as follows "abolition of property and application of all rents of land to public purposes." And to back this statement up, fail to pay your rent (property tax) and you will find out who owns it.

4. Ostensibly annexation is not a solitary issue concerning the State of Texas. Therefore is this movement -- which I consider unlawful, for it conquers areas under color of law, thus destroying the people's property rights and subjugating them to an entity that they want no part of -- is this annexation movement a part of a plan to advance Federal Regionalism?

The Buck Act of 1939 and

1940 promoted a ten region plan to destroy our natural state boundaries. One of the regions was shifted under President Nixon. This can be found in the Federal Register, volume 37, number 30 which was entered February 12, 1972.

5. Is this quest for territory, our homes and towns, connected in any way with the United Nations Agenda 21 plan or any other U.N. agendas?

6. If the answer concerning the U.N. is no, would you Senator Averitt and each member of the Texas Assembly affix their signature to an affidavit stating that there isn't any affiliation with that body?

7. Would you Senator Averitt and each member of the Texas Assembly affix their signature to an affidavit stating that there isn't any connection with the Federal Regionalization plan?

8. In what capacity are the Annexation Committees accountable to the public?

It is imperative for the political body or the annexation committees to have a complete understanding of, "What state all men are naturally in, that is, a state of perfect freedom to order their actions, and dispose of their possessions and persons as they think fit, within the bounds of the law of nature, without asking leave, or depending upon the will of any other man..."

Therefore to protect and to promote this basic philosophy, and to obtain safety and happiness and live in tranquility, sovereign individuals collectively joined together to create a form of government for the mutual protection of themselves and their posterity's individual God given inalienable rights. If the concept of enjoying liberty is violated in any manner by any governmental body, state, federal or foreign, then that government has committed an act of treason against the founding principles of this nation, and placed itself in a permanent state of war against the people.

Letters to the Editor

Dear Sirs,

Enclosed please find 25 stamps for the purpose of renewing my subscription to the NJM Letter for this year. This DONATION is given freely and I wish that it could be more. I have already sent in my '05 request for renewal but did not have the donation available at that time.

Thank you very much and please keep up the excellent work!
WW, State prisoner

* * *

Hello

My name is John
Im from Poland. Im interested in militia of USA and i believe that You are people of freedom. Some from my friends who worked of USA told me that freedom is finished in USA.

People say that real owner of USA is "B'nai B'rith. skul and bomes and bildberg. IS it truth?

I love of freedom and I like USA but it is sad what say my friends who worked in USA. People says that You have Big Brother and 1984 of Orwell
John

Ed.: Gotta love them law enforcement provocateurs, phony typos and all!

Never Quit

Life is odd with its twists and turns,
As every one of us sometimes learns,
And many a failure can be turned about,
When you might have won had you stuck it out;
So don't give up, though the pace seems slow,
You may succeed with another blow.

Success is failure turned inside out,
The silver tint of the clouds of doubt.
You can never tell how close you are,
It may be near when it seems afar;
So stay in the fight when you're hardest hit,
It's when things seem worst that you mustn't quit.

-- Anonymous

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Wake Co, NC, Dave (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 866-3288

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____